

Due May 1, 2008

Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Request for Iowa Four-Year College/University Performance Assessment System Funds

College/University Name: Iowa State University
Program Contact Person: David Whaley, Ph.D.
Title: Associate Dean for Teacher Education
Institution: Iowa State University
Address: E262B Lagomarcino; Ames, Iowa 50011-3188
Telephone: 515-294-1410
Fax: 515-294-7802
E-Mail: dwhaley@iastate.edu

College/University Name: Iowa State University
Program Contact Person: Hina Patel, Ph.D.
Title: Associate Director of the University Teacher Education Program
Institution: Iowa State University
Address: 0133 MacKay; Ames, Iowa 50011-1125
Telephone: 515-294-7886
Fax: 515-294-6467
E-Mail: hinap@iastate.edu

Business Office Contact Person: Carolyn Klaus
Title: Secretary
Address: 0133 MacKay; Ames, Iowa 50011-1125
Telephone: 515-294-6694
Fax: 515-294-6467
E-Mail: cklaus@iastate.edu

Statement of Assurances

Should a Performance Assessment System Award be made to the applicant in support of the activities proposed in this application, the authorized signature on the cover page of this application certifies to the Iowa Department of Education that the authorized official will:

1. Upon request, provide the Iowa Department of Education with access to records and other sources of information that may be necessary to determine compliance with appropriate federal and state laws and regulations;
2. Use grant funds to supplement and not supplant funds from nonfederal sources.

Certification by Authorized or Institutional Official:

The applicant certifies that to the best of his/her knowledge the information in this application is correct, that the filing of this application is duly authorized by the governing body of this organization, or institution, and that the applicant will comply with the attached statement of assurances.

Typed or Printed Name of Authorized Official	Title
Signature of Authorized Official	Date

Please submit both electronically and hard copy to Barry Wilson, TQE Assessment Team Leader, Dept. of Ed. Psych. & Foundations, UNI, Cedar Falls, IA by May 1, 2008.

Process for Procuring Grant Funds:

1. Submit Grant Request Package; Postmarked by May 1, 2008
Grant Request Package Contents:
 - Request for Performance Assessment System Funds Cover Page
 - Action Plan
 - Budget
2. Grant requests will be reviewed by the Assessment Committee, the Leadership Team, and the Iowa Department of Education.
3. Institution will be notified of a grant award by May 21, 2008
4. Contracts for awardees will be developed by the Iowa Department of Education upon notification to the IHE of the award.
5. It will take 30 days after the award notification for a contract to be executed and fully approved. This would be as per a June 1 notification.
6. Payments cannot be released until a contract is fully approved with all signatures.
7. Institutions should not incur costs before a contract is approved and plan accordingly.
8. To acquire each payment, an IHE must submit an invoice or letter with an original signature requesting funds. This is necessary for the release of each payment – fifty percent, forty percent, and final ten percent.
9. An Interim report must be submitted with an invoice by January 15, 2009. NOTE: an awardee will not receive the forty percent payment unless the Interim Report budget indicates that the first fifty percent has been spent.
10. A Final report must be submitted with an invoice by December 15, 2009
11. A report form or template is attached with this RFP. Please use it for the Interim and Final Reports. The form includes a narrative and budget.

The grant application and interim and final reports must be submitted electronically in addition to hard copy.

I. Context

Iowa State University of Science and Technology is one of the nation's premier land-grant universities and a Carnegie Doctoral/Research-Extensive University. The Iowa State University Teacher Education Program (UTEP) reflects the institutional strategic plan by preparing caring, competent and certified teachers poised to meet the challenges of a diverse and ever-changing world.

Teacher Education at Iowa State stretches across three colleges: Agriculture, Human Sciences, and Liberal Arts and Sciences. Of the approximately 26,000 students Iowa State University enrolls a year; approximately 1000 students are working towards teacher licensure. UTEP graduates approximately 300 licensed teachers per academic year. There are approximately 100 faculty members serving the University Teacher Education Program.

UTEP is directed by the Associate Dean for Teacher Education (beginning fall 2006), who is housed in the College of Human Sciences. The Associate Dean of Teacher Education carries out the policy and operations aspects of the program and chairs the University Teacher Education Program Committee (UTEPC). The UTEPC is the executive committee for program faculty. It consists of faculty members representing each undergraduate and graduate licensure area. This is the group that makes policy related decisions for all teacher education students (for example, admission criteria, standards assessments, curriculum changes, etc.). UTEPC has three subcommittees: Admissions, Assessment and Field Advisory. During the following academic year, we would like to include a community college representative on UTEPC to ensure a common understanding of expectations for teacher education candidates and make transfer policies as friendly as possible. Assessment results are shared during UTEPC meetings and aggregated data centered on transfer students would be provided to the community college representative in order to provide a greater understanding of the progress of their students. Due to our location and population, we would like to build bridges with local community colleges including DMACC, NIACC, and Kirkwood. Because of this connection, multiple institutions will benefit from these funds.

UTEP is a relatively new administrative entity that serves as the central contact between the Iowa Department of Education, Board of Educational Examiners and PK-12 schools. Because of the creation of this new administrative unit, UTEP is working diligently to create overarching (as opposed to department specific) processes that have the support of all relevant parties.

As a fortunate multi-year recipient of this grant, we have attached the final reports at the end of this document from December 12, 2007 and December 16, 2006.

II. Project Narrative

As a multi-year recipient of this grant, we have built a strong foundation in which future initiatives can rest upon. Previous funds provided the opportunity to build a database that gathers information for our three checkpoints: admission, student teaching and licensure. In addition, funds supported education of the functionality of the database to students and relevant faculty and staff. All of this work will culminate in the creation of a performance assessment system that is understood and used by all members in teacher education. We have three major goals if funds are provided:

Goal 1: Standards Assessments Support and Discussions

The University Teacher Education Program Committee has the onus to create a standard assessment system that is accepted by all teacher education faculty. The monthly meetings for 2007-2008 academic year began the discussion of the monitoring of standards assessments. Faculty coordinators were asked to create matrixes that indicate how the chapter 79 standards are addressed in their licensure area. However, more think time and discussion needs to occur before programmatic decisions can take place.

Below are the undergraduate and graduate licensure areas we offer as an initial teaching endorsement and the grade level and the College it is housed within. We have faculty coordinators and advisers for each of the licensure areas listed below. We would like to provide faculty support to complete curriculum matrixes that are essential in the assessment process. In addition, this time will be used to revise syllabi that integrate standards, standards assessments and corresponding rubrics.

- Early Childhood Education (Birth to Grade 3) – Human Sciences
- Elementary Education (grades K-6) – Human Sciences
- Agricultural Education (grades 5-12) – Agriculture
- Biology Education (grades 5-12) – Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Chemistry Education (grades 5-12) – Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Earth Sciences Education (grades 5-12) – Liberal Arts and Sciences
- English Education (grades 5-12) – Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Family and Consumer Sciences Education (grades 5-12) – Human Sciences
- Health Education (grades 5-12) – Human Sciences
- History-Social Sciences Education (grades 5-12) – Human Sciences and Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Mathematics Education (grades 5-12) – Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Music Education (grades K-12) – Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Physical Education (grades K-12) – Human Sciences
- Physical Science Education (grades 5-12) – Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Physics Education (grades 5-12) – Liberal Arts and Sciences
- World Languages and Cultures Education (grades 5-12) – Liberal Arts and Sciences (French, German, Latin, Russian, and Spanish)

These advisers and coordinators are the individuals that will be spending the most amount of time working on the matrixes and syllabi. We would like to provide \$500 to each person in the summer of 2008 (during non-University contract time) to serve as a mini grant and an incentive to complete the work required to have a uniform assessment system.

\$500 X 16 coordinators= **\$8,000**

Recipients of this mini grant would first sign a memorandum conveying their understanding of the responsibility connected with this support.

In addition to the financial support, whole group conversations with the University Teacher Education Program Committee need to continue. During the academic year, half of the agenda has to be allotted to business including chapter 79 revisions, appeals, and policy changes. We would like to host a one day retreat before the start of the 2008-2009 academic year that is dedicated solely to monitoring standards assessments. Prior to this retreat, we will host Barry Wilson on campus to further discuss the plans for the assessment system. His guidance will provide a basis for the retreat.

1 Day, All Day Retreat

Facility Fee:	\$150
Attendance: approximately 20 people	
Refreshments:	
Continental breakfast is \$6.00 a person X 20 =	\$120
Lunch is \$10.00 a person X 20 =	\$200
Copying/office supplies =	\$100
Total =	\$570

Goal 2: Standards Assessments Monitoring and Education

The financial support and discussions will lead to a final decision on the way standards are assessed at Iowa State. If the decision is made that an e-portfolio system will be integrated throughout the program then the following pieces will need to take place. (Please note, regardless of the format of the performance assessment system, the following pieces will need to occur for that format to be fully integrated into the system).

A coordinator of this initiative needs to be designated in order to centralize the process. If an e-portfolio system is adopted an on-campus system will be used as opposed to an external vendor. This will allow the program to take on the cost, not the students. The internal system is called e-Doc. In order for a template to be created that can be used by all teacher education students, the coordinator will collaborate with a programmer to ensure established specifications are met. Acceptance of this initiative will involve a culture shift from students creating a pedagogical portfolio to a placement portfolio.

\$225 (daily salary of coordinator) X 10 working days = \$2,250 for summer 2008 and \$2,250 for fall and spring 2009 for a total of **5,000**.

It will cost approximately **\$2,500** for the programmer to customize an e-Doc for all teacher education students. This will include time where the programmer will work on an individual basis with faculty coordinators who wish to deviate from the template by adding licensure specific requirements.

Education of e-Doc with Faculty, Staff and Students:

We would like to host two ½ day seminars at the end of spring 2009 inviting faculty, coordinators and advisers on how to use e-Doc in a consistent manner throughout the program. This session will also be used to educate and further enhance skills on the UTEP Database (which previous funds were used for).

Attendance: approximately 85 people

Refreshments:

Continental breakfast is \$6.00 a person X 85 =	\$510
Lunch is \$10.00 a person X 85 =	\$850
Copying/office supplies =	\$100
Total =	\$1,460

In addition, students will need to be trained on how to use e-Doc. The start date for implementation of this new standards assessment system will be fall 2009. For Elementary Education majors it will be a part of the required learning community titled Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers. For the other licensure areas, it will need to be integrated in orientation courses or the courses that include student's first experience in PK-12 schools. This process will need to be determined and will be a part of the discussions that are held in Goal 1.

Attendance: approximately 250 students

Refreshments:

\$5.00 a person X 250 =	\$1,250
Copying/office supplies =	\$100
Total =	\$1,350

Goal 3: Maintenance of UTEP Database

Annually, we are asked to contribute funds for the continual maintenance and upgrades of the UTEP Database (previous funds were used to build this system). We would like to allot **\$1,120** to support and expand this system.

Fulfillment of these three goals will result in a significant improvement of our present assessment system. Currently, each licensure area has different ways of monitoring students understanding of each of the standards. Many of the programs are using portfolios (not necessarily electronic portfolios). Others are using specific assignments in specific courses to assess students understanding of the standards, but a cumulative project is not required. Because of these differences, it is challenging to have a bird's eye view on students' progress. These funds will provide an opportunity to have the important discussions that are necessary to come to an agreement on a consistent method of monitoring the standards.

III. Action Plan

Goal	Objectives	Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Budget Request
Goal 1	Standards Assessments Support	Create a memorandum explaining the responsibilities attached to the funds then distribute the funds.	David Whaley	Summer 2008	\$8,000
	Standards Assessments Discussions	Organize and hold the retreat.	David Whaley	August 2008	\$570
Goal 2	Standards Assessments Monitoring	Coordinator will work with a programmer to customize e-Doc.	Hina Patel, Coordinator Pete Boysen, Programmer	Summer 2008 for preliminary work then Fall, Spring, Summer 2009	\$5,000 \$2,500
	Standards Assessments Education	Education of Faculty, Staff, and Students	Hina Patel	Spring and Fall 2009	\$1,460 \$1,350
Goal 3	Maintenance of UTEP Database	Provide funds to Career Management Services to continue the maintenance of the UTEP Database.	Carolyn Klaus	Fall 2009	\$1,120
Total Funds Requested:					\$20,0000

IV. Sustainability Plan

Funds will continue to provide support to meet the requirements of Chapter 79 assessment systems. Previous funding allowed for the development of a UTEP Database. This database fulfilled 79.15(2) sections b, c, and d by providing an electronic system to input data on the three checkpoints: admission, student teaching and licensure. In addition, the reports developed from this database assist with the completion of the Annual Summary Report on Practitioner Preparation, which is discussed in 79.15(3).

79.15(2) Performance assessment system for teacher candidates.

- a. The system is an integral part of the unit's planning and evaluation system.*
 - b. The system has multiple admission criteria and assessments to identify candidates with the potential to become successful teachers.*
 - c. The system includes the administration of a basic skills test with program admission denied to any applicants failing to achieve the institution's designated criterion score.*
 - d. The system has multiple decision points. (Minimum: admission to professional education program, approval for student teaching, and recommendation for licensure.)*
 - e. The system includes a coherent, sequential assessment system for individual teacher candidates that is shared with faculty with guidance for course and program improvement, as well as assessment criteria (e.g., rubrics) and a process for ongoing feedback to teacher candidates about their achievement of program standards with guidance for reflection and improvement, and is drawn from multiple formative and summative assessments of each of the following, including, but not limited to, institutional assessment of content knowledge, professional knowledge, and pedagogical knowledge and their applications, and teaching performance including the effect on student learning.*
- 79.15(3) The unit annually reports to the department such data as is required by the state and federal governments at dates determined by the department.*
-

The projected funds will begin the building of an e-portfolio system that is used by all teacher licensure candidates and fulfills standard 79.15(2), specifically, section e. This system will allow faculty and students to gain a better understanding of their strengths and weaknesses. Faculty will ask students to upload standards assessments that are designated for their courses. Students will receive feedback from faculty on completion of the standard assessment. Students will also have a view that allows them to see how they are progressing through all of the standards assessments required for their program. Faculty will receive overall reports on how students are progressing on standards and which standards have the largest amount of remediation/retake requests, which conveys the need for a more critical examination of the curricular objectives associated with that standard (79.15(1) h). Projected funds will allow the University Teacher Education Program to critically examine course content.

We will be able to sustain these initiatives because the funds were kindly provided at the most critical time period—the beginning. It is at the start of these projects when programmers are involved and significant funds are used for software customization. The jump start these funds have provided will allow us to internally budget for the annual maintenance costs. In the future, our budget will be tailored to include a line item for the UTEP Database and e-Doc.

V. Budget Requests

Please note, the action plan in section three may provide a more detailed view of budget requests.

Personnel	
Wages	\$8,000 \$5,000 \$2,500
Expenses (Travel, Meals, Lodging)	
Professional Services/Professional Development	
Fees	
Expenses (Mileage, Meals, Lodging, Room Rental)	
Software	\$1,120
Hardware	
Supplies and Materials	\$570 \$1,460 \$1,350
Phone/Mail	
Other – specify:	
Other – specify:	
Total	\$20,000

VI. Budget Narrative

Two of the above sections provide a detailed rationale for the budget: the Project Narrative (section II) and the Action Plan (section III). However, we would like to emphasize there is a great need for the maximum award amount due to the complexity of our program. It is challenging to have five faculty members agree on a plan to monitor successful completion of standards assessments, but it is a feat to have approximately 100! We performed our due diligence with previous funds in order for them to be used as projected. Only minor modifications were made to align actions with the overall vision of the program. If funds are provided, the work that is accomplished by December 2009 will not go to waste. A sustainability plan is in place to continue the efforts that the funds jump started. We deeply appreciate your consideration.

Performance Assessment System Funds

Final Report

December 12, 2007

Submitted by:

College/University Name: **Iowa State University**

Program Contact Person: **David Whaley, Ph.D.**

Title: **Associate Dean for Teacher Education**

Institution: **Iowa State University**

Address: **E262B Lagomarcino; Ames, Iowa 50011-3188**

Telephone: **515-294-1410**

Fax: **515-294-7802**

E-Mail: **dwhaley@iastate.edu**

College/University Name: **Iowa State University**

Program Contact Person: **Hina Patel, Ph.D.**

Title: **Associate Director of the University Teacher Education Program**

Institution: **Iowa State University**

Address: **0133 MacKay; Ames, Iowa 50011-1125**

Telephone: **515-294-7886**

Fax: **515-294-6467**

E-Mail: **hinap@iastate.edu**

Business Office Contact Person: **Carolyn Klaus**

Title: **Secretary**

Address: **0133 MacKay; Ames, Iowa 50011-1125**

Telephone: **515-294-6694**

Fax: **515-294-6467**

E-Mail: **cklaus@iastate.edu**

I. Action Plan

Goal	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Budget Request/ Budget Spent
Goal 1: IT	Hina Patel Vendor Relevant Parties	March-December 2007	Budget Request: \$9,800 Budget Spent as of 10.01.07: \$4,100 Budget Spent as of 12.12.07: \$7,000
Goal 2: Standards Assessments	David Whaley Hina Patel	March-December 2007	Budget Request: \$1,500 Budget Spent as of 10.01.07: \$731.64 Budget Spent as of 12.12.07: \$505.74
Goal 3: Dispositions	UTEPC Field Advisory Subcommittee Hina Patel Vendor	March-December 2007	Budget Request: \$1,500 Budget Spent as of 10.01.07: Grouped with Goal 2 expenditures. Budget Spent as of 12.12.07: Grouped with Goal 2

			expenditures.
Goal 4: Transfer Students Assessment Data	UTEPC Assessment Subcommittee Hina Patel Vendor	Summer/ Fall 2007	Budget Request: \$2,000 Budget Spent as of 10.01.07: \$827.35 Budget Spent as of 12.12.07: \$1010.27
Goal 5: Education of Students	Hina Patel Vendor	August-December 2007	Budget Request: \$5,000 Budget Spent as of 10.01.07: \$4125 Budget Spent as of 12.12.07: \$1500
Goal 6: Reporting	Hina Patel Vendor	Summer 2007	\$0.00

Note: The final grant allocation was \$19, 800.00.

Because of the Performance Assessment System Grant, the administrative office for the University Teacher Education Program (UTEP) was able to design a customized electronic database that can be accessed by all stakeholders: teacher education students, faculty and staff. This database will house the information collected during the three checkpoints. In addition, it has reporting functionality which will assist in making data driven decisions.

Goal 1: IT Development and Maintenance

ISU's Career Management Services System, the larger database where the UTEP Assessment Database is housed, has customized a section to meet the data needs of the UTEP office. David Whaley, Hina Patel, Linda Reindl and Carolyn Klaus have met with representatives of the Career Management Services database on a biweekly basis through out the summer and fall of 2007. The 'Teacher Certification' tab has been created and contains the fields where data can be inputted for all three checkpoints (admission, field experiences and licensure). External programmers were called in to meet the challenging requests of field experiences staff members. The fields are available for data entry, but one request has not yet been completed (controlling when the data can be viewable to students). Because of the extra time spent on this request, we are \$1300 over the budget for goal one.

Goal 2: Integration of Standards Assessments in the UTEP Assessment Database

Goal 2 is in progress. UTEP has hosted a myriad of meetings this semester that provided opportunities for departments to share their thoughts on revising the present performance assessment system. A strong foundation has been created by David Whaley, who has led this piece of the grant, and a final plan will be created in spring 2008 with implementation in fall 2008. Funds have been used to coordinate these meetings in a fashion where participation is peaked. The meetings that occurred this semester that focused on standards assessments included: 1. Monthly UTEPC Meetings to discuss standards, reveal inconsistencies in the monitoring of standards and related consequences, and to create a process for assessing standards that is more similar then different for each of the 16 undergraduate licensure areas. 2. Meetings with Secondary Education Coordinators and Department Chairs to gauge their thoughts on the assessment of standards. 3. Individual Meetings with UTEP Coordinators to support the integration of the new system. 4. UTEP Faculty and Student Forums to discuss programmatic concerns by stakeholders. The associated costs related to hosting retreats, meetings, and forums equaled to \$505.74 for printing, bookstore, and dining services.

Goal 3: Integration of Dispositional-Related Concerns and Commendations into UTEP Assessment Database

The Field Advisory Subcommittee met to discuss state and local work on dispositions. Ann Pierce provided a synopsis of their work this fall at the December University Teacher Education Program Committee (policy making body for teacher education)

meeting. Part of the work completed by the committee included modifying the form according to the suggestions by the Multicultural Education team. Also, faculty coordinators for the different licensure areas were asked to pilot the state-wide document on dispositions in their methods courses and then complete the short survey on the usability of the instrument. The Field Advisory Subcommittee will play a major role when integrating dispositional data into the new database. In addition, they will play an advising role when integrating evaluations from cooperating teachers and supervisors into the database.

The associated costs relating to hosting meetings, including but not limited to, office supplies and meal expenditures have been grouped with Goal 2 expenditures.

Goal 4: Provide feedback to two-year institutions on the performance of their graduates

The UTEPC Assessment Subcommittee surveys graduates from the program and their employers. The goal for this subcommittee was to meet with community college representatives to discuss what questions/responses would be of value for their program improvement. Dave Whaley met with representatives from DMACC and NIACC this fall who were asked to nominate a faculty/staff member from teacher education who would be interested in attending the first assessment subcommittee meeting in the spring. In addition, a student office assistant was hired to assist with the associated data entry component at a cost of \$1010.27.

Goal 5: Education of Students on UTEP Assessment Database

A budget of \$750 was initially requested for a staff member to attend a conference on electronic standards assessments. These funds were funneled to a meeting hosted by the UTEP office for fifteen teacher education faculty and staff members regarding requirements for admission, standards, and standards assessments on December 13, 2007. In addition, two UTEP Assessment Database training sessions for UTEP advisers and coordinators occurred on December 5 and December 11. These meetings granted access to the new database and walked participants through the manager and student views. These meetings and associated fees for a presenter equaled to \$1500.

Goal 6: Reporting Functionality

Through the biweekly meetings, knowledge transfer has occurred from IT (vendor) to UTEP, specifically, training on advanced features of the database such as reporting.

Thanks to you support, we can look forward to using the new UTEP Assessment Database.

Performance Assessment System Funds

Final Report

December 15, 2006

Submitted by:

Name: Hina Patel, Ph.D. and David Whaley, Ph.D.

Title: University Teacher Education Program Coordinator and Associate Dean for Teacher Education

Institution: Iowa State University

Address: E116 Lagomarcino; Ames, Iowa 50011-3188

Telephone: 515-294-7886

Fax: 515-294-6467

E-Mail: utep@iastate.edu

II. Action Plan

Original Budget Request.

Goal	Level of Completion	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Budget Request
Goal 1 Evaluate/Select Database Vendor	Completed	Hina Patel Linda Reindl	December 2005 - March 2006	\$0.00
Goal 2 System Design Phase	Completed	Dave Whaley Hina Patel Linda Reindl	January 2006 - March 2006	\$636
Goal 3 Software Customization	Partially Completed	Hina Patel Linda Reindl Vendor (CMS)	March 2006 - August 2006	\$15,000
Goal 4 System Implementation and Training	Partially Completed	Hina Patel Linda Reindl Vendor (CMS)	Fall 2006	\$3,886

Note: The final grant allocation was \$19,392.00.

Goal 1: Evaluate/Select Database Vendor

Three student database software packages were evaluated by UTEP constituencies:

1. Live Text
2. ISU's Central IT's System
3. ISU's Career Management Services System (a.k.a. CMS or previously referred to as Simplicity)

After careful review of the three vendors, ISU's Career Management Services System (CMS) was chosen by the Teacher Education Program Operations Team as the software that best meets the needs of the University Teacher Education Program. Attributes of CMS include:

- Local hosting
- Open source
- Link to ISU Registrar's System (student records are updated weekly)

- Highly configurable

Goal 2: System Design Phase

The grant writing team has consulted with potential users and has created a set of specifications and parameters for the database and its operation. System Design Meetings occurred showcasing a beta version of the database.

System Design Meeting #1: All UTEP advisors, coordinators and administration were informed of the UTEP Database initiative. Support for this initiative was expressed. In addition, the Career Services Coordinator and Classification Officer have attended preliminary meetings with UTEP Staff and ISU's Career Management Services System to share their perspective.

System Design Meeting #2: The beta version of the UTEP Database was reviewed by the members of the UTEP Field Advisory Subcommittee, which includes representation from UTEP Administration, Faculty, Supervisors and Advisers. A one-on-one meeting has been scheduled with the lead academic adviser for the majority of teacher education students for additional input during the development stage.

Goal 3: Software Customization

ISU's Career Management Services System is in the process of utilizing the system design and operations plan to customize its product to meet UTEP needs. Weekly meetings were in effect in June and July 2006 for this process. At the end of July, Simplicity asked for a two week reprieve to further analyze functionality of the software, as well as wait for the start date of the new Associate Dean for Teacher Education, Dave Whaley. In August, Dave Whaley met with the group to provide a 'go ahead' and to discuss the parameters of the budget. After this feedback and approval was provided, software customization has continued. Hina Patel and Linda Reindl have met with CMS representatives on a weekly (and at times, biweekly) basis. An integration plan for the 'Teacher Certification' tab has been established. Fields for admission to UTEP have been integrated into the system:

powered by simplicity

Iowa State University Career Management Services

: Abigail J Mitton - (UTEP)

cancel print preview

UTEP Admission

Student [REDACTED]

Type Admission

Employer UTEP

Background Check #1 yes

Background Waiver/Fee #1 yes

Background Check Date October 29, 2006

UTEP Admission Term Fall 2006

UTEP Admission Type Full

Student Teaching Term Fall 2008

Licensure Term Fall 2008

Pre-Admission Field Experience yes

Completed Information Sheet and Learning Objectives no

Completed Self-Evaluation no

Completed Program Evaluation no

Completed Semester Report no

Completed Employer Evaluation no

Information Sheet and Learning Objectives

Hours Per Week 0

cancel print preview

Edit

Hina Patel and Linda Reindl have inputted the data from fall 2006 Admission into the CMS system. Licensure fields have been discussed at length and are under development. The next step is for CMS to inform UTEP that the licensure fields are live. Then Linda Reindl will input data into the Licensure fields. After that point, representatives from the Field Experiences Office will meet with CMS and share their needs then CMS will create these fields. CMS will provide training to the Field Experiences Office on how to access and manipulate the fields. Then they will be tested by the Field Experiences Office.

Goal 4: System Implementation and Training

After that point, the UTEP Coordinator, Licensure Analyst and Field Experience representatives will receive advance training on the use of the CMS system, including the reporting feature. CMS will provide further advance training to the UTEP Coordinator who will manage future changes to the database. The final step is a joint training session led by CMS and the UTEP Coordinator for UTEP Advisers and Coordinators who will use this system to review the progress of teacher education students. Students will be informed of this database during orientation courses and at the time of admission.

II. Actual Expenditures

The following represents the actual expenditures from this grant:

Goal	Level of Completion	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Actual Expenditures
Goal 1 Evaluate/Select Database Vendor	Completed	Hina Patel Linda Reindl	December 2005 - March 2006	\$0.00
Goal 2	Completed	Hina Patel	January 2006 -	\$636.00

System Design Phase		Linda Reindl	March 2006	
Goal 3 Software Customization	Partially Completed	Hina Patel Linda Reindl Vendor (CMS)	March 2006 - August 2006	\$17, 000.00
Goal 4 System Implementation and Training	Partially Completed	Hina Patel Linda Reindl Vendor (CMS)	Fall 2006	\$1, 756.00
			Total	\$ 19, 392.00

Explanation:

As noted above, this project entailed: a) the evaluation of existing databases and the identification of a database vendor, b) software design, c) software customization, and d) system implementation and training. The slight variance from the initial budget occurred in software customization and system implementation and training. More time (hours) in software customization was needed in order to develop and refine the database. This resulted in an additional \$ 2, 000 needed in this line to pay for this extra programmer time. Fortunately, project staff were able to streamline the system implementation and training activities and thus meet the original budget allocation of \$19, 392.00.